arXiv:1601.03436v1 [math.RA] 13 Jan 2016

On Semiprime Goldie Modules

Jaime Castro Pérez*
Escuela de Ingeniería y Ciencias, Instituto Tecnolólogico y de Estudios Superiores de Monterrey
Calle del Puente 222, Tlalpan, 14380, México D.F., México.
Mauricio Medina Bárcenas† José Ríos Montes‡
Angel Zaldívar§
Instituto de Matemáticas, Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México
Area de la Investigación Científica, Circuito Exterior, C.U., 04510, México D.F., México.

January 15, 2016

Abstract

For an R-module M, projective in $\sigma[M]$ and satisfying ascending chain condition (ACC) on left annihilators, we introduce the concept of Goldie module. We also use the concept of semiprime module defined by Raggi et. al. in [16] to give necessary and sufficient conditions for an R-module M, to be a semiprime Goldie module. This theorem is a generalization of Goldie's theorem for semiprime left Goldie rings. Moreover, we prove that M is a semiprime (prime) Goldie module if and only if the ring $S = End_R(M)$ is a semiprime (prime) right Goldie ring. Also, we study the case when M is a duo module.

Keywords: Prime module, Semiprime module, Goldie module, Essentially compressible module, Duo module.
2010 Mathematics Subject Classification: 16D50, 16D80, 16P50, 16P70.

Introduction

Goldie's Theorem states that a ring R has a semisimple artinian classical left quotient ring if and only if R is a semiprime ring with finite uniform dimension and satisfies ACC on left annihilators. Wisbauer proves in ([20], Theorem 11.6)

*jcastrop@itesm.mx, corresponding author
†mmedina@matem.unam.mx
‡jrios@matem.unam.mx
§zaldivar@matem.unam.mx

a version of Goldie's Theorem in terms of modules. For a retractable R-module M with $S = End_R(M)$ the following conditions are equivalent: *1.* M is non M-singular with finite uniform dimension and S is semiprime, *2.* M is non M-singular with finite uniform dimension and for every $N \leq_e M$ there exists a monomorphism $M \to N$, *3.* $End_R(\widehat{M})$ is semisimple left artinian and it is the classical left quotient ring of S, here $\widehat{M}$ denotes the M-injective hull of M. Also, in [8] the authors study when the endomorphism ring of a semiprojective module is a semiprime Goldie ring.

In this paper we give another generalization of Goldie's Theorem. For this, we use the product of submodules of a module M defined in [3] to say when a module is a semiprime module. This product extends the product of left ideals of a ring R, so R is a semiprime module (over itself) if and only if R is a semiprime ring in the usual sense.

In order to have a definition of Goldie Module such that it extends the classical definition of left Goldie ring, we introduce what ascending chain condition on left annihilators means on a module. A left annihilator in M is a submodule of the form $\mathcal{A}_X = \bigcap_{f \in X} Ker(f)$ for some $X \subseteq End_R(M)$. This definition with $R = M$ is the usual concept of left annihilator.

The main concept of this work is that an R-module M is a Goldie module if M satisfies ACC on left annihilators and has finite uniform dimension. We prove some characterizations of semiprime Goldie modules (Theorem 2.8, Theorem 2.22 and Corollary 2.23) which generalize the Goldie's Theorem and extends the Theorem 11.6 of [20] and corollary 2.7 of [8].

We organize this paper in three sections. Section 1 proves several results for semiprime modules. We also generalize Theorem 10.24 of [10] to semiprime artinian modules.

In section 2 we introduce the concept of Goldie modules. We prove the main Theorem of this paper and a characterization of semiprime Goldie modules. We also obtain some examples of Goldie modules. We also prove that if M has finitely many minimal prime submodules P_1,...,P_t in M such that M/P_i $(1 \leq i \leq t)$ has finite uniform dimension, then M is Goldie module if and only if each M/P_i is Goldie module for $(1 \leq i \leq t)$. We also give a description of the submodule $\mathcal{Z}(N)$ with $N \in \sigma[M]$.

In the last section we apply the previous results to duo modules which extend results for commutative rings. In [13] the authors say that they do not know a duo module with a quotient not duo, in this section we show an example.

Throughout this paper R will be an associative ring with unit and R-Mod will denote the category of unitary left R-modules. A submodule N of an R-module M is denoted by $N \leq M$. If N is a proper submodule we write $N < M$. We use $N \leq_e M$ for an essential submodule. Let M and X be R-modules. X is said to be M-generated if there exists an epimorphism from a direct sum of copies of M onto X. Every R-module X has a largest M-generated submodule called the trace of M in X, defined by $tr^M(X) = \sum\{f(M) | f : M \to X\}$. The category $\sigma[M]$ is defined as the smallest full subcategory of R-Mod containing all R-modules X which are isomorphic to a submodule of an M-generated module.

A module $N \in \sigma[M]$ is called singular in $\sigma[M]$ or M-singular, if there is an exact sequence in $\sigma[M]$, $0 \to K \to L \to N \to 0$ with $K \leq_e L$. The class $\mathcal{S}$ of all M-singular modules in $\sigma[M]$ is closed under submodules, quotients and direct sums. Therefore, any $L \in \sigma[M]$ has a largest M-singular submodule

$$\mathcal{Z}(L) = \sum\{f(N) | N \in \mathcal{S} \text{ and f} \in \mathrm{Hom_R(N, L)}\}$$

L is called non M-singular if $\mathcal{Z}(L) = 0$.

Let M be an R-module. In [2] the annihilator in M of a class $\mathcal{C}$ of modules is defined as $Ann_M(\mathcal{C}) = \bigcap_{K \in \Omega} K$, where

$$\Omega = \{K \leq M | \text{there exists W} \in \mathcal{C} \text{ and f} \in \mathrm{Hom_R(M, W)} \text{ with K} = \mathrm{Ker(f)}\}$$

Also in [2], the author defines a product in the following way: Let $N \leq M$. For each module X, $N \cdot X = Ann_M(\mathcal{C})$ where $\mathcal{C}$ is the class of modules W such that $f(N) = 0$ for all $f \in Hom_R(M, W)$.

For an R-module M and K, L submodules of M, in [3] the product $K_M L$ is defined by $K_M L = \sum\{f(K) | f \in Hom_R(M, L)\}$. Moreover, in [2] it is showed that if M is projective in $\sigma[M]$, and $N \leq M$, then $N \cdot X = N_M X$ for every module X.

A nonzero R-module M is called monoform if for each submodule N of M and each morphism $f : N \to M$, f is either zero or a monomorphism. M has enough monoforms if each nonzero submodule of M contains a monoform submodule.

Let M-tors be the frame of all hereditary torsion theories on $\sigma[M]$. For a family $\{M_\alpha\}$ of modules in $\sigma[M]$, let $\chi(\{M_\alpha\})$ the greatest element of M-tors for which all M_α are torsion free. Let $\xi(\{M_\alpha\})$ be the least element of M-tors for which all M_α are torsion. $\xi(\{M_\alpha\})$ and $\chi(\{M_\alpha\})$ are called the hereditary torsion theory generated by the family $\{M_\alpha\}$ and the hereditary torsion theory cogenerated by the same family. In particular, the greatest and least elements in M-tors are denoted by χ and ξ respectively. If $\tau \in M - tors$, let $\mathbb{T}_\tau$, $\mathbb{F}_\tau$ and t_τ denote the torsion class, the torsion free class and the preradical associated to τ, respectively. For details about concepts and terminology concerning torsion theories in $\sigma[M]$, see [19] and [20].

1 Semiprime Modules

Definition 1.1. Let $M \in R - Mod$ and K, L submodules of M. Put $K_M L = \sum\{f(K) | f \in Hom_R(M, L)\}$. For the properties of this product see [4] Proposition 1.3.

Definition 1.2. Let $M \in R - Mod$. We say a fully invariant submodule $N \leq M$ is a *prime submodule* in M if for any fully invariant submodules $K, L \leq M$ such that $K_M L \leq N$, then $K \leq N$ or $L \leq N$. We say M is a *prime module* if 0 is a prime submodule.

Proposition 1.3. *Let M be projective in $\sigma[M]$ and P a fully invariant submodule of M. The following conditions are equivalent:*

1. *P is prime in M.*
2. *For any submodules K, L of M containing P and such that $K_M L \leq P$, then $K = P$ or $L = P$.*

Proof. *1* $\Rightarrow$ *2* : By Proposition 1.11 of [4].

2 $\Rightarrow$ *1* : Suppose that K, L are submodules of M such that $K_M L \leq P$.

We claim that $K_M(L+P) \leq P$. Since $K_M L \leq L \cap P$, by Proposition 5.5 of [2] $K_M(L/L \cap P) = 0$ so $K_M(L + P/P) = 0$. Thus $K_M(L+P) \leq P$.

On the other hand,

$$(K+P)_M(L+P) = K_M(L+P) + P_M(L+P) \leq P$$

because P is fully invariant in M.

Then, by hypothesis $K + P = P$ or $L + P = P$, hence $K \leq P$ or $L \leq P$. □

Definition 1.4. We say a fully invariant submodule $N \leq M$ is a *semiprime submodule* in M if for any fully invariant submodule $K \leq M$ such that $K_M K \leq N$, then $K \leq N$. We said M is a *semiprime module* if 0 is a semiprime submodule.

Lemma 1.5. *Let M be projective in $\sigma[M]$ and N a fully invariant submodule of M. The following conditions are equivalent:*

1. *N is semiprime in M.*
2. *For any submodule K of M, $K_M K \leq N$ implies $K \leq M$.*
3. *For any submodule $K \leq M$ containing N such that $K_M K \leq N$, then $K = N$.*

Proof. *1* $\Rightarrow$ *2* : Let $K \leq M$ such that $K_M K \leq N$. Consider the submodule $K_M M$ of M. This is the minimal fully invariant submodule of M which contains K and $K_M X = (K_M M)_M X$ for every module X. Hence by Proposition 1.3 of [4] we have that

$$K_M K = (K_M M)_M K \leq ((K_M M)_M K)_M M) \leq N_M M$$

Since N is fully invariant submodule of M then $N_M M = N$ and by Proposition 5.5 of [2] $(K_M M)_M (K_M M) = ((K_M M)_M K)_M M) \leq N$. Since N is semiprime in M, $K_M M \leq N$. Hence $K \leq N$.

2 $\Rightarrow$ *1* : By definition.

1 $\Leftrightarrow$ *3* : Similar to the proof of Proposition 1.3. □

In Remark 1.26 below, we give an example where the associativity of the product $(\cdot)_M(\cdot)$ is not true in general.

Definition 1.6. Let $M \in R - Mod$ and N a fully invariant submodule of M. We define the *powers* of N as:

1. $N^0 = 0$
2. $N^1 = N$
3. $N^m = N_M N^{m-1}$

Lemma 1.7. *Let M be projective in $\sigma[M]$ and N semiprime in M. Let J be a fully invariant submodule of M such that $J^n \leq N$ then $J \leq N$.*

Proof. By induction on n. If $n = 1$ the result is clear.

Suppose $n > 1$ and the Proposition is valid for $n-1$. We have that $2n-2 \geq n$ then

$$J^{2n-2} \leq N$$

so

$$(J^{n-1})^2 = J^{n-1}{}_M J^{n-1} \leq N$$

since N is semiprime $J^{n-1} \leq N$ then $J \leq N$. □

Proposition 1.8. *Let $S := End_R(M)$ and assume M generates all its submodules. If N is a fully invariant submodule of M such that $Hom_R(M, N)$ is a prime (semiprime) ideal of S, then N is prime (semiprime) in M.*

Proof. Let K and L be fully invariant submodules of M such that $K_M L \leq N$. Put $I = Hom_R(M, L)$ and $J = Hom_R(M, K)$. Let $m \in M$ and $\sum f_i g_i \in IJ$. Since $g_i \in J$ and $g_i(m) \in K$ then $\sum f_i(g_i(m)) \in K_M L \leq N$. Hence $IJ \leq Hom_R(M, N)$. Since $Hom_R(M, N)$ is prime (semiprime) in S, then $I \leq Hom_R(M, N)$ or $J \leq Hom_R(M, N)$. Hence $tr^M(L) := Hom(M, L)M \leq N$ or $tr^M(K) \leq N$ and since M generates all its submodules then $L \leq N$ or $K \leq N$. Thus N is a prime (semiprime) submodule. □

Next definition aper in [9]

Definition 1.9. *A module M is* retractable *if $Hom_R(M, N) \neq 0$ for all $0 \neq N \leq M$*

Corollary 1.10. *Let $S := End_R(M)$ with M retractable. If S is a prime (semiprime) ring then M is prime (semiprime).*

Proof. Let K and L be fully invariant submodules of M such that $K_M L = 0$. Since $Hom_R(M, 0)$ is a prime (semiprime) ideal of S then by the proof of 1.8, $tr^M(K) = 0$ o $tr^M(L) = 0$. Since M is retractable, $K = 0$ or $L = 0$. Hence 0 is prime (semiprime) in M. Thus M is prime (semiprime). □

Proposition 1.11. *Let M be projective in $\sigma[M]$ and N a proper fully invariant submodule of M. The following conditions are equivalent:*

1. *N is semiprime in M.*
2. *If $m \in M$ is such that $Rm_M Rm \leq N$, then $m \in N$.*
3. *N is an intersection of prime submodules.*

Proof. *1* $\Rightarrow$ *2* : By Lemma 1.5.

2 $\Rightarrow$ *3* : Since N is proper in M, let $0 \neq m_0 \in M \setminus N$. Then $Rm_{0M}Rm_0 \nleq N$. Now, let $0 \neq m_1 \in Rm_{0M}Rm_0$ but $m_1 \notin N$ Then $Rm_{1M}Rm_1 \nleq N$ and $Rm_{1M}Rm_1 \leq Rm_{0M}Rm_0$. We obtain a sequence of non-zero elements of M, $\{m_0, m_1, ...\}$ such that $m_i \notin N$ for all i and $Rm_{i+1M}Rm_{i+1} \leq Rm_{iM}Rm_i$.

By Zorn's Lemma there exists a fully invariant submodule P of M with $N \leq P$, maximal with the property that $m_i \notin P$ for all i .

We claim P is a prime submodule. Let K and L submodules of M containing P. Since $P \leq K$ and $P \leq L$, then there exists m_i and m_j such that $m_i \in K$ and $m_j \in L$. Suppose $i \leq j$, then $Rm_{iM}Rm_i \leq K$ and by construction $m_j \in Rm_{iM}Rm_i$ and thus $m_j \in K$. If we put $k = max\{i, j\}$, then $m_k \in K$ and $m_k \in L$. Hence, $Rm_{kM}Rm_k \leq K_M L$, and so $K_M L \nleq P$. By Proposition 1.3, P is prime in M.

3 $\Rightarrow$ *1* : It is clear. □

Proposition 1.12. *Let $0 \neq M$ be a semiprime module and projective in $\sigma[M]$. Then M has minimal prime submodules in M.*

Proof. By the proof Proposition of 1.11, M has prime submodules. Let $P \leq M$ be a prime submodule. Consider $\Gamma = \{Q \leq P | Q \text{ is prime}\}$. This family is not empty because $P \in \Gamma$. Let $\mathcal{C} = \{Q_i\}$ be a descending chain in Γ. Let $N, K \leq M$ be fully invariant submodules of M such that $N_M K \leq \bigcap \mathcal{C}$. Suppose that $N \nleq \bigcap \mathcal{C}$. Then there exists Q_j such that $N \nleq Q_j$ and $N \nleq Q_l$ for all $Q_l \leq Q_j$. Therefore $K \leq Q_l$ for all $Q_l \leq Q_j$, and since $\mathcal{C}$ is a chain then $K \leq \bigcap \mathcal{C}$. Therefore $\bigcap \mathcal{C} \in \Gamma$. By Zorn's Lemma Γ has minimal elements. □

Remark 1.13. Notice that if M is projective in $\sigma[M]$ and M has prime submodules in M, then M has minimal prime submodules.

Corollary 1.14. *Let $0 \neq M$ be a semiprime module and projective in $\sigma[M]$. Then*

$$0 = \bigcap \{P \leq M | P \text{ is a minimal prime in } M\}.$$

Proof. Let $x \in \bigcap \{P \leq M | P \text{ is a minimal prime in } M\}$ and $Q \leq M$ be a prime submodule in M. By Proposition 1.12 there exists a minimal prime submodule P such that $P \leq Q$ then $x \in Q$ and x is in the intersection of all primes in M. By Proposition 1.11, $x = 0$. □

Lemma 1.15. *Let $M \in R - Mod$ and N a minimal submodule of M. Then $N^2 = 0$ or N is a direct summand of M.*

Proof. Suppose that $N_M N \neq 0$. Then there exists $f : M \to N$ such that $f(N) \neq 0$. Since $0 \neq f(M) \leq N$ and N is a minimal submodule, $f(M) = N$. On the other hand, $Ker(f) \cap N \leq N$, since $f(N) \neq 0$ then $Ker(f) \cap N = 0$. We have that $(M/Ker(f)) \cong N$ and since N is a minimal submodule $Ker(f)$, then is a maximal submodule of M. Thus $Ker(f) \oplus N = M$. □

Corollary 1.16. *Let M be a retractable module. If N is a minimal submodule in a semiprime module M, then N is a direct summand.*

Proof. Since M is semiprime, $N_M N \neq 0$. □

Theorem 1.17. *The following conditions are equivalent for a retractable R-module M:*

1. *M is semisimple and left artinian.*
2. *M is semiprime and left artinian.*
3. *M is semiprime and satisfies DCC on cyclic submodules and direct summands.*

Proof. *1* $\Rightarrow$ *2* : If M is semisimple then it is semiprime.

2 $\Rightarrow$ *3* : Since M is left artinian, then it satisfies DCC on cyclic submodules and direct summands.

3 $\Rightarrow$ *1* : Since M satisfies DCC on cyclic submodules, there exists K_1 a minimal submodule of M. By Corollary 1.16, $M = K_1 \oplus L_1$. Now there exists K_2 a minimal submodule of L_1 and $L_1 = K_2 \oplus L_2$. With this process we obtain a descending chain of direct summands, which by hypothesis it is finite $L_1 \supseteq L_2 \supseteq L_3 \supseteq ... \supseteq L_m$. Since L_m is simple and $M = K_1 \oplus K_2 \oplus ... \oplus K_m \oplus L_m$, then M is semisimple.

Now, if M is semisimple and satisfies DCC on direct summands then M is artinian. □

Definition 1.18. Let $M \in R - Mod$ and $N \leq M$. We say N is an *annihilator submodule* if $N = Ann_M(K)$ for some $0 \neq K \leq M$.

Lemma 1.19. *Let M be semiprime and projective in $\sigma[M]$. Let $N, L \leq M$. If $L_M N = 0$, then $N_M L = 0$ and $L \cap N = 0$.*

Proof. Since $L_M N = 0$, then

$$0 = N_M(L_M N)_M L = (N_M L)_M(N_M L).$$

Hence $N_M L = 0$.

Now, since $L \cap N \leq L$ and $L \cap N \leq N$, then

$$(L \cap N)_M(L \cap N) \leq L_M N = 0.$$

Thus $L \cap N = 0$ □

Corollary 1.20. *Let M be semiprime and projective in $\sigma[M]$. If $N \leq M$, then $N_M Ann_M(N) = 0$.*

Proposition 1.21. *Let M be semiprime and projective in $\sigma[M]$ and $N \leq M$. Then N is an annihilator submodule if and only if $N = Ann_M(Ann_M(N))$*

Proof. $\Rightarrow$: By Lemma 1.20 $N \leq Ann_M(Ann_M(N))$. There is $K \leq M$ such that $N = Ann_M(K)$, hence

$$K_M N = K_M Ann_M(K) = 0$$

and thus $K \leq Ann_M(N)$. Therefore,

$$Ann_M(Ann_M(N)) \leq Ann_M(K) = N$$

It follows that $N = Ann_M(Ann_M(N))$.

$\Leftarrow$: By definition of annihilator submodule. □

Proposition 1.22. *Let M be semiprime and $N \leq M$. Then, $Ann_M(N)$ is the unique pseudocomplement fully invariant of N. Moreover, $N \bigoplus Ann_M(N)$ intersects all fully invariant submodules of M.*

Proof. Let $L \leq M$ be a fully invariant pseudocomplement of N in M. Then

$$L_M N \leq L \cap N = 0$$

Thus $L \leq Ann_M(N)$. Observe that

$$(Ann_M(N) \cap N)_M(Ann_M(N) \cap N) \leq (Ann_M(N) \cap N)_M N = 0$$

Since M is semiprime, $Ann_M(N) \cap N = 0$. Thus $L = Ann_M(N)$. □

Lemma 1.23. *Let M be a semiprime module and $N \leq M$. Let S be the set of all minimal prime submodules of M which do not contain N. Then $Ann_M(N) = \bigcap\{P | P \in S\}$.*

Proof. Put $K = \bigcap\{P | P \in S\}$. Any element in $K \cap N$ is in the intersection of all minimal prime submodules of M which is zero. Then $K \cap N = 0$. Since K is fully invariant in M, $K_M N \leq K \cap N = 0$. Thus, $K \leq Ann_M(N)$. Now, let $P \in S$. Since $Ann_M(N)_M N = 0 \leq P$ and $N \nleq P$, then $Ann_M(N) \leq K$. □

Lemma 1.24. *Let M be projective in $\sigma[M]$. If M is semiprime then M is retractable.*

Proof. Let $N \leq M$ and suppose $Hom_R(M, N) = 0$. Then $Ann_M(N) = M$. So $M_M N = 0$ but $N_M N \subseteq M_M N = 0$. Since M is semprime then $N = 0$ by Lemma 1.5. □

Proposition 1.25. *Let M be projective in $\sigma[M]$ and semiprime. The following conditions are equivalent for $N \leq M$:*

1. *N is a maximal annihilator submodule.*
2. *N is an annihilator submodule and is a minimal prime submodule.*
3. *N is prime in M and N is an annihilator submodule.*

Proof. *1* $\Rightarrow$ *2* : Let $K \leq M$ such that $N = Ann_M(K)$. Let $L, H \leq M$ be fully invariant submodules of M such that $L_M H \leq N$. Assume $H \nleq N$. Then $0 \neq H_M K$. Hence $Ann_M(K) \leq Ann_M(H_M K)$, but since $Ann_M(K)$ is a maximal annihilator submodule, then $Ann_M(K) = Ann_M(H_M K)$.

As M is projective in $\sigma[M]$, by Proposition 5.5 of [2], we have that

$$L_M(H_M(H_M K)) = (L_M H)_M(H_M K) \leq N_M(H_M K) = 0$$

Now, since $H_M(H_M K) \leq H_M K$, then

$$Ann_M(K) = Ann_M(H_M K) \leq Ann_M(H_M(H_M K))$$

Therefore $Ann_M(H_M K) = Ann_M(H_M(H_M K))$. Thus $L \leq Ann_M(K) = N$.

Now, let $P \leq M$ be a prime submodule of M such that $P < N$. We have that $N_M K = 0 \leq P$. So $K \leq P < N$. Hence $K_M K = 0$. Thus $K = 0$, but M is semiprime, a contradiction. It follows that N is a minimal prime submodule of M.

2 $\Rightarrow$ *3* : By hypothesis.

3 $\Rightarrow$ *1* : Suppose $N < K$ with K an annihilator submodule. Then

$$Ann_M(K)_M K = 0 \leq N$$

Since N is prime in M, then $Ann_M(K) \leq N < K$. By Proposition 1.22 $Ann_M(K) \cap K = 0$, hence $Ann_M(K) = 0$. Since K is an annihilator submodule, by Proposition 1.21, $K = Ann_M(Ann_M(K)) = Ann_M(0) = M$. □

Remark 1.26. Following the notation of Example 1.12 of [4] Let $R = \mathbb{Z}_2 \rtimes (\mathbb{Z}_2 \oplus \mathbb{Z}_2)$. This ring has only one maximal ideal I and it has three simple ideals: J_1, J_2, J_3, which are isomorphic. Then, the lattice of ideals of R has the form



Moreover, R is artinian and R-Mod has only one simple module up to isomorphism. Let S be a simple module. By Theorem 2.13 of [15], the lattice of fully invariant submodules of $E(S)$ has tree maximal submodules N, L and K, and it has the form



Put $M = E(S)$. Since $K \cap L = S$ and $K_M L \leq K \cap L$, then $K_M L \leq S$. On the other hand consider the composition

$$M \xrightarrow{\pi} M/N \xrightarrow{\cong} S \xrightarrow{i} L$$

$f = i \circ \pi$ where π is the natural projection and i is the inclusion. Then, $f(K) = S$ and $S \leq K_M L$. Thus, $K_M L = S$. Notice that $K_M L \leq N$ but $K \nleq N$ and $L \nleq N$. Hence N is not prime in M. Analogously, we prove that neither K nor L are prime in M. We also note that $K_M K = S$. Moreover, $\pi(K) = S$, so $K_M S = S$. In the same way $L_M S = S$ and $N_M S = S$

Let $g : M \to K$ be a non zero morphism. If $Ker(g) \cap S = 0$ then g is a monomorphism, a contradiction. So $Ker(g) \cap S = S$. Thus $S_M K = 0$ and $Ann_M(K) = S$. Analogously $Ann_M(L) = S = Ann_M(N) = Ann_M(S)$. Since $S_M S \leq S_M K$, $S_M S = 0$. Thus M is not semiprime. Hence, S is a maximal annihilator submodule of M which is not prime because $K_M K = S$. With this we can see that associativity is not true in general, because $L_M(K_M S) = L_M S = S$ and $(L_M K)_M S = S_M S = 0$. Notice that, in this example $Hom_R(M, H) \neq 0$ for all $H \in \sigma[M]$ in particular M is retractable, but M is not projective in $\sigma[M]$.

Proposition 1.27. *Let M be projective in $\sigma[M]$ and semiprime. For $N \leq M$, if $N = Ann_M(U)$ with $U \leq M$ a uniform submodule, then N is a maximal annihilator in M.*

Proof. Suppose that $N < K$ with K an annihilator submodule in M. Since $N = Ann_M(U)$ by Proposition 1.22, $K \cap U \neq 0$. By hypothesis U is uniform and thus $K \cap U \leq_e U$. Then

$$(K \cap U) \oplus Ann_M(U) \leq_e U \oplus Ann_M(U)$$

Now, notice that if $L \leq_{FI} M$, by Proposition 1.22 $(U \oplus Ann_M(U)) \cap L \neq 0$. So $((K \cap U) \oplus Ann_M(U)) \cap L \neq 0$. Therefore, $K \cap L \neq 0$ and K intersects all fully invariant submodules of M . Since $K \cap Ann_M(K) = 0$ and $Ann_M(K) \leq_{FI} M$, then $Ann_M(K) = 0$. Thus, $K = Ann_M(Ann_M(K)) = Ann_M(0) = M$. □

Proposition 1.28. *Let M be projective in $\sigma[M]$ and semiprime with finite uniform dimension. Then:*

1. *M has finitely many minimal prime submodules.*
2. *The number of annihilators submodules is finite.*
3. *M satisfies ACC on annihilators submodules.*

Proof. 1 : Let $U_1, .., U_n$ be uniform submodules of M such that $U_1 \oplus ... \oplus U_n \leq_e M$. By Proposition s 1.25 and 1.27, $P_i := Ann_M(U_i)$ is a minimal prime submodule of M for each i. By Proposition 1.22, $(U_1 \oplus ... \oplus U_n) \cap Ann_M(U_1 \oplus ... \oplus U_n) = 0$ and $P_1 \cap ... \cap P_n \leq Ann_M(U_1 \oplus ... \oplus U_n) = 0$.

Now, if P is a minimal prime submodule of M, then

$$P_1 {}_M P_2 {}_M \cdots {}_M P_n \leq P_1 \cap ... \cap P_n = 0 \leq P$$

Hence, there exists j such that $P_j \leq P$, a contradiction.

2 : By Lemma 1.23.

3 : It is clear by *2*. □

2 Goldie Modules

The following definition was taken from [17]

Definition 2.1. Let $M \in R - Mod$. M is *essentially compressible* if for every essential submodule $N \leq_e M$ there exists a monomorphism $M \to N$.

Definition 2.2. Let $M \in R - Mod$. We call a left annihilator in M a submodule

$$\mathcal{A}_X = \bigcap \{Ker(f) | f \in X\}$$

for some $X \subseteq End_R(M)$.

Definition 2.3. We say M is a *Goldie module* if it satisfies ACC on left annihilators and has finite uniform dimension.

Lemma 2.4. *Suppose M is projective in $\sigma[M]$. If $N \in \sigma[M]$ is essentially compressible, then $Ann_M(N)$ is a semiprime submodule of M.*

Proof. Let $L \leq M$ be a fully invariant submodule of M such that $L_M L \leq Ann_M(N)$. Put

$$\Gamma = \{K \leq N | L_M K = 0\}$$

Then $\Gamma \neq \emptyset$ and by Zorn's Lemma there exists a maximal independent family $\{K_i\}_I$ in Γ. Notice that $\bigoplus_I K_i \in \Gamma$ because

$$L_M \bigoplus_I K_i = \bigoplus_I L_M K_i = 0$$

Let $0 \neq A \leq N$ be a submodule. Since $(L_M L)_M A = 0$ then $L_M A \in \Gamma$.

If $L_M A = 0$ then $A \in \Gamma$ and $A \cap \bigoplus_I K_i \neq 0$ because $\{K_i\}$ is a maximal independent family in Γ.

Now, if $L_M A \neq 0$ we also have $(L_M A) \cap \bigoplus_I K_i \neq 0$ and $(L_M A) \cap \bigoplus_I K_i \leq A \cap \bigoplus_I K_i$. Thus $\bigoplus_I K_i \leq_e N$.

By hypothesis there exists a monomorphism $\theta : N \to \bigoplus_I K_i$. Then

$$\theta(L_M N) \leq L_M \bigoplus_I K_i = 0$$

and hence $L_M N = 0$. Thus $L \leq Ann_M(N)$. □

Proposition 2.5. *Let M be projective in $\sigma[M]$. If $N \in \sigma[M]$ is an M-singular module, then $Ker(f) \leq_e M$ for all $f \in Hom_R(M, N)$.*

Proof. Let $f \in Hom_R(M, N)$. Since N is M-singular, there exists an exact sequence

$$0 \longrightarrow K \xrightarrow{i} L \xrightarrow{\pi} N \longrightarrow 0$$

in $\sigma[M]$ with $K \leq_e L$. Since M is projective in $\sigma[M]$, there exists $\hat{f} : M \to L$ such that $\pi\hat{f} = f$:

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} & & M & & \\ & \swarrow^{\hat{f}} & \downarrow{\scriptstyle f} & & \\ L & \xrightarrow{\pi} & N & \longrightarrow & 0 \end{array}$$

As $K \leq_e L$, then $\hat{f}^{-1}(K) \leq_e M$. Then

$$f(\hat{f}^{-1}(K)) = \pi(\hat{f}(\hat{f}^{-1}(K))) \leq \pi(K) = 0.$$

Therefore, $\hat{f}^{-1}(K) \leq Ker(f)$ and hence $Ker(f) \leq_e M$. □

Proposition 2.6. *Let M be projective in $\sigma[M]$. If M is essentially compressible then M is non M-singular.*

Proof. Suppose $\mathcal{Z}(M) \neq 0$. If $\mathcal{Z}(M) \leq_e M$, then there exists a monomorphism $\theta : M \to \mathcal{Z}(M)$, by Proposition 2.5 $Ker\theta \leq_e M$, a contradiction. Therefore $\mathcal{Z}(M)$ has a pseudocomplement K in M and thus $\mathcal{Z}(M) \oplus K \leq_e M$. Hence, there exists a monomorphism $\theta : M \to \mathcal{Z}(M) \oplus K$. Let $\pi : \mathcal{Z}(M) \oplus K \to \mathcal{Z}(M)$ be the canonical projection, then $Ker(\pi\theta) \leq_e M$ and so $Ker(\pi\theta) = \theta^{-1}(Ker\pi) = \theta^{-1}(K) \leq_e M$. But $\mathcal{Z}(M) \cap \theta^{-1}(K) = 0$,contradiction. Thus $\mathcal{Z}(M) = 0$. □

Lemma 2.7. *Let $M \in R - Mod$ with finite uniform dimension. Then, for every monomorphism $f : M \to M$, $Im(f) \leq_e M$.*

Proof. Let $f : M \to M$ be a monomrfism. If the uniform dimension of M is n, $(Udim(M) = n)$ and there exists $K \leq M$ such that $f(M) \cap K = 0$, then $Udim(f(M) \oplus K) = n + 1$, a contradiction. □

Theorem 2.8. *Let M be projective in $\sigma[M]$ with finite uniform dimension. The following conditions are equivalent:*

1. *M is semiprime and non M-singular*

2. *M is semiprime and satisfies ACC on annihilators*

3. *Let $N \leq M$, then $N \leq_e M$ if and only if there exists a monomorphism $f : M \to N$.*

Proof. *1* $\Rightarrow$ *2* : Since M is non M-singular and has finite uniform dimension then, by Proposition 3.6 of [6] M satisfies ACC on annihilators. This proves *2*.

2 $\Rightarrow$ *3* : Let $N \leq M$. Suppose that $N \leq_e M$. Since M is semiprime with uniform dimension and satisfies ACC on annihilators, then M is essentially compressible by Proposition 3.13 of [6]. Now, if $f : M \to N$ is a monomorphism then $N \leq_e M$ by lemma 2.7.

3 $\Rightarrow$ *1* : It follows from Lemma 2.4 and Proposition 2.6. □

Remark 2.9. Notice that Theorem 2.8 is a generalization of Goldie's Theorem. See [11] Theorem 11.13.

In Proposition 3.13 of [6], M is a generator of $\sigma[M]$, but by Lemma 1.24 this hypothesis is not necessary.

Corollary 2.10. *Let M be projective in $\sigma[M]$ and semiprime. Then, M has finite uniform dimension and enough monoforms if and only if M is a Goldie module.*

Proof. $\Rightarrow$: Since M is semiprime with finite uniform dimension and enough monoforms, then M is non M-singular by Proposition 3.8 of [6]. By Theorem 2.8, M is a Goldie module.

$\Leftarrow$: If M is a Goldie module, M has finite uniform dimension and by Theorem 2.8 M is non M-singular. Hence the uniform submodules of M are monoform. Since M has finite uniform dimension every submodule of M contains a uniform, hence every submodule contains a monoform. □

For the definition of M-Gabriel dimension see [4] section 4.

Corollary 2.11. *Let M be projective in $\sigma[M]$ with finite uniform dimension. If M is a semiprime module and has M-Gabriel dimension, then M is a Goldie module.*

Proof. Let $N \leq M$. Since M has M-Gabriel dimension, by Lemma 4.2 of [4], N contains a cocritical submodule L. Then L is monoform. By Proposition 2.10 M is a Goldie module. □

Corollary 2.12. *Let M be projective in $\sigma[M]$ and semiprime with Krull dimension. Then M is a semiprime Goldie module.*

Proof. Since M has Krull dimension, M has finite uniform dimension and enough monoforms. By Proposition 2.10 M is a Goldie module. □

Proposition 2.13. *Suppose that M is progenerator of $\sigma[M]$. Let $N \in \sigma[M]$, then*

$$\mathcal{Z}(N) = \sum \{f(M) | f : M \to N \; ker(f) \leq_e M\}.$$

Proof. By definition of M-singular module, it is clear that $\sum\{f(M)|f : M \to N\ ker(f) \leq_e M\} \leq \mathcal{Z}(N)$. Now, let $n \in \mathcal{Z}(N)$ and consider $Rn \leq \mathcal{Z}(N)$. Since $Rn \in \sigma[M]$ there exists a natural number t and an epimorphism $\rho : M^t \to Rn$. Suppose that $(m_1, .., m_t)$ is such that $\rho(m_1, ..., m_t) = n$. If $j_i : M \to M^t$ are the inclusions $(i = 1, ..., t)$, then by Proposition 2.5 $Ker(\rho \circ j_i) \leq_e M$. Thus, $n = \sum_{i=1}^{t} \rho \circ j_i(m_i) \in \sum\{f(M)|f : M \to N\ ker(f) \leq_e M\}$. □

Remark 2.14. Let $M \in R - Mod$ and consider $\tau_g \in M - tors$, where $\tau_g = \xi(\{S \in \sigma[M]|S\ is\ M - singular\})$. If $M \in \mathbb{F}_{\tau_g}$, by [20] Proposition. 10.2, we have that $\chi(M) = \tau_g$. Let t_{τ_g} be the preradical associated to τ_g. Then

$$t_{\tau_g}(N) = \sum\{S \leq N|S \in \mathbb{T}_{\tau_g}\} = \sum\{S \leq N|S\ is\ M - singular\} = \mathcal{Z}(N).$$

Proposition 2.15. *Suppose M is progenerator of $\sigma[M]$. If M is semiprime Goldie, then*

$$\mathcal{Z}(N) = \sum f(M)$$

where the sum is over the $f : M \to N$ such that there exists $\alpha \in End_R(M)$ monomorphism with $\alpha(M) \leq_e M$ and $f\alpha = 0$.

Proof. Let $N \in \sigma[M]$. By Proposition 2.13

$$\mathcal{Z}(N) = \sum\{f(M)|f : M \to N\ ker(f) \leq_e M\}.$$

If $f : M \to N$ with $Ker(f) \leq_e M$, by Theorem 2.8 there exists a monomorphism $\alpha : M \to Ker(f)$. We have that $f\alpha = 0$ and by Lemma 2.7 $\alpha(M) \leq_e (M)$.

Let $f : M \to N$ such that there exists $\alpha : M \to M$ $f\alpha = 0$ and $\alpha(M) \leq_e (M)$. Then $\alpha(M) \leq Ker(f)$. Therefore $Ker(f) \leq_e (M)$. □

Remark 2.16. Let R be a ring such that R-Mod has an infinite set of non-isomorphic simples modules. Consider $M = \bigoplus_I S_i$, I an infinite set, such that S_i is a simple module for all $i \in I$ and with $Si \ncong S_j$ if $i \neq j$. This module does not have finite uniform dimension and, in M-tors, $\tau_g = \chi$. Then, if $N \in \sigma[M]$

$$t_{\tau_g}(N) = \mathcal{Z}(N) = \sum f(M)$$

where the sum is over the $f : M \to N$ such that there exists $\alpha \in End_R(M)$ monomorphism with $\alpha(M) \leq_e M$ and $f\alpha = 0$.

This example shows that the converse of the last Proposition is not true in general.

Following [1]

Definition 2.17. *A module M is* weakly compressible *if for any nonzero submodule N of M, there exists $f : M \to N$ such that $f \circ f \neq 0$.*

Remark 2.18. Notice that if M is weakly compressible then M is a semiprime module. The converse hold if M is projective in $\sigma[M]$

Next definition was taken from [8]

Definition 2.19. *A module M is a* semiprojective *module if $I = Hom(M, IM)$ for any cyclic right ideal I of $End_R(M)$*

For other characterizations see [19].

Proposition 2.20. *Let M be projective in $\sigma[M]$ and retractable. Then, $S := End_R(M)$ is semiprime if and only if M is semiprime.*

Proof. $\Rightarrow$: Corollary 1.10.

$\Leftarrow$: If M is semiprime, since M is projective in $\sigma[M]$ then M is weakly compressible and semiprojective. Then, by [[8]. Theorem 2.6 (b)] S is semiprime. □

Lemma 2.21. *Let M be projective in $\sigma[M]$ and retractable. M is non M-singular if and only if $Hom_R(M/N, M) = 0$ for all $N \leq_e M$.*

Proof. $\Rightarrow$: If $N \leq_e M$ then M/N is M-singular, then $Hom_R(M/N, M) = 0$.

$\Leftarrow$: Suppose $\mathcal{Z}(M) \neq 0$. Since M is retractable there exists $0 \neq f : M \to \mathcal{Z}(M)$. By Proposition 2.5 $Ker(f) \leq_e M$, so there exists a non zero morphism form $M/Ker(f) \to M$. □

For a retractable R-module M, Theorem 11.6 of [20] gives necessary and sufficient conditions in order to $T := End_R(\widehat{M})$ being semisimple, left artinian, and being the classical left quotient ring of $S = End_R(M)$. Also, in ([8], Corollary 2.7) the authors give necessary and sufficient conditions for a semiprojective module M to S being a semiprime right Goldie ring. We give an extension of these results.

Theorem 2.22. *Let M be projective in $\sigma[M]$, $S = End_R(M)$ and $T = End_R(\widehat{M})$. The following conditions are equivalent:*

1. *M is a semiprime Goldie module.*
2. *T is semisimple right artinian and is the classical right quotient ring of S.*
3. *S is a semiprime right Goldie ring.*
4. *M is weakly compressible with finite uniform dimension, and for all $N \leq_e M$, $Hom_R(M/N, M) = 0$.*

Proof. *1* $\Rightarrow$ *2* : By Proposition 2.20, S is a semiprime ring. Since M is a Goldie module, then M is non M-singular with finite uniform dimension, hence by [20] Proposition 11.6, T is right semisimple and is the classical right quotient ring of S.

2 $\Rightarrow$ *3* : By [11] Theorem 11.13, S is a semiprime right Goldie ring .

3 $\Rightarrow$ *4* : By [8] Corollary 2.7.

4 $\Rightarrow$ *1* : Since M is weakly compressible then M is semiprime. By Lemma 2.21 M is non M-singular. Thus, by Theorem 2.8 M is a Goldie module. □

Corollary 2.23. *Let M be projective in $\sigma[M]$, $S = End_R(M)$ and $T = End_R(\widehat{M})$. The following conditions are equivalent:*

1. *M is a prime Goldie module.*
2. *T is simple right artinian and is the classical right quotient ring of S.*
3. *S is a prime right Goldie ring.*
4. *Given nonzero submodules N, K of M there exists a morphism $f : M \to N$ such that $K \nsubseteq Ker(f)$. M has finite uniform dimension and for all $N \leq_e M$, $Hom(M/N, M) = 0$.*

Proof. *1* $\Rightarrow$ *2* : By Proposition 2.22, S is a semiprime ring and T is right semisimple and the classical right quotient ring of S. Let $0 \neq I \leq T$ be an ideal. Since T is semisimple, there exits an ideal $J \leq T$ such that $T = I \oplus J$. Put $M_1 = I\widehat{M}$ and $M_2 = J\widehat{M}$. Then M_1 and M_2 are fully invariant submodules of $\widehat{M}$ and $M_1 \cap M_2 = 0$ because $I \cap J = 0$. Consider $M_1 \cap M$ and $M_2 \cap M$. If $f \in S$, then there exists $\hat{f} \in T$ such that $f = \hat{f}|_M$. Let $x \in M_1 \cap M$. Then $f(x) = \hat{f}(x) \in M_1 \cap M$ since M_1 is a fully invariant submodule of $\widehat{M}$. Thus $M_1 \cap M$ is a fully invariant submodule of M. In the same way, $M_2 \cap M$ is fully invariant in M. Since $(M_1 \cap M) \cap (M_2 \cap M) = 0$, then $(M_1 \cap M)_M(M_2 \cap M) = 0$. Hence $M_1 \cap M = 0$ or $M_2 \cap M = 0$ because M is prime. On the other hand, $M \leq_e \widehat{M}$ and so $M_1 = 0$ or $M_2 = 0$. Since $0 \neq I$, then $M_2 = 0$. Thus $J = 0$, and it follows that T is a simple ring.

2 $\Rightarrow$ *3* : By [11] Corollary 11.16, S is a prime right Goldie ring.

3 $\Rightarrow$ *4* : Let N, K be nonzero submodules of M, if $K \subseteq Ker(f)$ for all $f : M \to N$ then $0 = Hom_R(M, N)Hom(M, K) \leq S$. Then $Hom_R(M, N) = 0$ or $Hom_R(M, K) = 0$. By retractability, $N = 0$ or $K = 0$, a contradiction.

4 $\Rightarrow$ *1* It is clear. □

Remark 2.24. Suppose that M and N are R-modules such that $\sigma[N] \subseteq \sigma[M]$. If N is non M-singular, then N is non N-singular. This is because if there exists an exact sequence $0 \to L \to K \to N \to 0$ in $\sigma[N]$ such that $L \leq_e N$, then this sequence is in $\sigma[M]$ which implies that N is M-singular, a contradiction.

Proposition 2.25. *Let M be projective in $\sigma[M]$ and semiprime with finitely many minimal prime submodules $P_1, ..., P_t$. Suppose every quotient M/P_i $(1 \leq i \leq t)$ has finite uniform dimension. Then M is a Goldie module if and only if each M/P_i is a Goldie module.*

Proof. $\Rightarrow$: Suppose M is a Goldie module and P_i is a minimal prime submodule of M. By hypothesis, each M/P_i has finite uniform dimension. Notice that by proposition 1.14

$$P_i \subseteq Ann_M(P_1 \cap ... \cap P_{i-1} \cap P_{i+1} \cap ... \cap P_n)$$

Since M has finite uniform dimension there exist a uniform submodule U_i of $P_1 \cap ... \cap P_{i-1} \cap P_{i+1} \cap ... \cap P_n$. So $P_i \subseteq Ann_M(U_i)$. By Propositions 1.25 and

1.27, $P_i = Ann_M(U_i)$. Then, there exists a monomorphism $M/P_i \to {U_i}^X$ and since U_i is non M-singular, then M/P_i is non M-singular. Thus M/P_i is non (M/P_i)-singular by Remark 2.24. Since M/P_i is a prime module, by Theorem 2.8 M/P_i is a Goldie module.

$\Leftarrow$: By Corollary 1.14 there exists a monomorphism $M \to \bigoplus_{i=1}^{t} M/P_i$. Since each M/P_i has finite uniform dimension then M has finite uniform dimension.

Let $0 \neq N$ be a submodule of M. Since there exists a monomorphism $M \to \bigoplus M/P_i$ then there exists $1 \leq i \leq t$ and submodules $0 \neq K \leq M/P_i$ and $0 \neq N' \leq N$ such that $K \cong N'$. We have that M/P_i is a Goldie module, thus it has enough monoforms. Hence N' has a monoform submodule, that is M has enough monoforms, and so by Corollary 2.10 M is Goldie module. □

Remark 2.26. Notice that if M is a semiprime Goldie module then M has finitely many minimal prime submodules by Proposition 1.28. So in the proof $\Rightarrow$: of Proposition 2.25 this hypothesis is not used.

Definition 2.27. Let $M \in R-Mod$ and $N \leq M$. We say N is a *regular submodule* if there exists a monomorphism $M \to N$. Denote

$$Reg(M) := \{N \leq M | N \text{ regular submodule}\}$$

Remark 2.28. There exists modules with regular submodules which are nonessential. For example, a pure infinite module, see [12].

Proposition 2.29. *Let M be projective in $\sigma[M]$ and a semiprime Goldie module. Then, N is a regular submodule of M if and only if N is essential in M.*

Proof. Since M is Goldie, every regular submodule is essential by Lemma 2.7. Now, let $N \leq_e M$. By Theorem 2.8, N is a regular submodule. □

If $K \in \sigma[M]$, we say that K is $Reg(M)$-injective if any morphism $f : N \to K$ with $N \in Reg(M)$ can be extended to a endomorphism of M.

Corollary 2.30. *Let M be projective in $\sigma[M]$ and a semiprime Goldie module. Let $K \in \sigma[M]$. If K is $Reg(M)$-injective, then K is M-injective.*

3 Duo Modules

Following [13]

Definition 3.1. Let $M \in R-Mod$. M is a *duo module* if every submodule of M is fully invariant in M.

Examples:

1. If ${}_RS$ is a simple module then, S is a duo module.
2. If ${}_RM = \bigoplus_I S_i$ with S_i simple and S_i not isomorphic to S_j $i \neq j$ then M is a duo module.

3. An R-module M is called a multiplication module if every $N \leq M$ is of the form $IM = N$ for some ideal I of R. These modules are examples of duo modules. See [18]

4. Consider the example in Remark 1.26 that was taken from [4]. In that paper it is proved that $M/K \cong S \cong M/L \cong M/N$, hence L, K and N are maximal submodules of M. It follows that K/S, L/S and N/S are maximal submodules of M/S. Moreover, since $K \cap L = S = K \cap N = N \cap L$, then $M/S = K/S \oplus L/S$. Thus

$$K/S \cong \frac{M/S}{L/S} \cong M/L \cong S$$

This implies that K/S is simple, and analogously L/S and N/S are simple.

Let $0 \neq T < M$. Since $S \leq_e M$, then $S \leq T$. If $T = S$, then T is fully invariant. Suppose that $T \neq S$ and $T \notin \{K, L, N\}$. We have that $S \leq T \cap K \leq K$. Moreover, since K/S is simple, then $T \cap K = S$ or $T \cap K = K$. If $T \cap K = K$ then $K \leq T < M$; but K is maximal, then $K = T$, a contradiction. Thus, $T \cap K = S$. Analogously $T \cap L = S = T \cap N$.

Let $0 \neq x \in M$. If $ann_R(x) = 0$, there exists a monomorphism $R \to M$ and thus $E(R) = M$, a contradiction, because $E(R) \cong M \oplus M$ (see [4], Example 1.12) and M is a indecomposable injective module. Thus, $ann_R(x) \neq 0$ for all $0 \neq x \in M$.

Let $0 \neq x \in T$. Since $ann_R(x) \neq 0$, then $ann_R(x) \in \{I, J_1, J_2, J_3\}$. By Theorem 2.13 of [15] we have that:

- If $ann_R(x) = I$ then $x \in S$
- If $ann_R(x) = J_1$ then $x \in K \cap T = S$
- If $ann_R(x) = J_2$ then $x \in L \cap T = S$
- If $ann_R(x) = J_3$ then $x \in N \cap T = S$

Therefore $T \leq S$, a contradiction. Thus, all submodules of M are fully invariant.

Remark 3.2. In [13] the authors state that they did not know an example of a duo module M and a submodule N such that M/N is not a duo module. In this example, M is a duo module, but $M/S \cong S \oplus S$ is not a duo module.

Proposition 3.3. *M is a duo module as R-module and it generates all its submodules if and only if M is a multiplication module as $End_R(M)$-module.*

Proof. $\Rightarrow$: Let $S = End_R(M)$ and let N be a submodule of M. Since M is a duo module, N is fully invariant, thus $Hom_R(M, N)$ is an ideal of S. Since M generates all its submodules, then $N = tr^M(N) = Hom_R(M, N)M$. Thus, M is a multiplication module as $End_R(M)$-module.

$\Leftarrow$: It is clear. □

Proposition 3.4. *Let M be projective in $\sigma[M]$. Suppose that M is a semiprime and non M-singular duo module. Then, for every subset $X \subseteq End_R(M)$ we have that:*

$$Ann_M(Ann_M(\bigcap_X Ker(f))) = \bigcap_X Ker(f)$$

Proof. Since M is a duo module, by Proposition 1.22, $Ann_M(\bigcap_X Ker(f))$ is the unique pseudocomplement of $\bigcap_X Ker(f)$. Then

$$\bigcap_X Ker(f) \leq_e Ann_M(Ann_M(\bigcap_X Ker(f))).$$

Since M is non M-singular, $\bigcap_X Ker(f)$ has no essential extensions in M by Lemma 3.5 of [6]. Thus, we have the equality. □

Proposition 3.5. *Let M projective in $\sigma[M]$. Suppose that M is a semiprime and non M-singular duo module. The following conditions are equivalent:*

1. *M has finite uniform dimension.*
2. *M has a finite number of minimal prime submodules.*
3. *The number of annihilators in M is finite.*
4. *M satisfies the ACC on annihilators.*
5. *M satisfies the ACC on pseudocomplements.*

Proof. *1* $\Rightarrow$ *2* $\Rightarrow$ *3* : Are true by Proposition 1.28.
3 $\Rightarrow$ *4* : By Proposition 3.4.
4 $\Rightarrow$ *5* : By Proposition 1.22.
5 $\Rightarrow$ *1* : By [11] Proposition 6.30. □

Proposition 3.6. *Let M be projective in $\sigma[M]$. Suppose M is a prime duo module with finite uniform dimension. Then, $Udim(M) = 1$*

Proof. Since M is prime, 0 is the unique minimal prime submodule of M. By Proposition 1.28, there exists a uniform submodule U of M such that $0 = Ann_M(U)$. By Proposition 1.22, $U \leq_e M$. Thus, $Udim(M) = 1$. □

Theorem 3.7. *Let M be projective in $\sigma[M]$. If M is a semiprime duo module, then the following conditions are equivalent:*

1. *M is a prime Goldie module.*
2. *$\widehat{M}$ is indecomposable and M is non M-singular.*
3. *M is uniform and non M-singular.*

Proof. *1* $\Rightarrow$ *2* : Since M is a prime module, by Proposition 3.6, $Udim(M) = 1$ and then $\widehat{M}$ is indecomposable. Since M is a Goldie module, by Theorem 2.8 M is non M-singular.

2 $\Rightarrow$ *3*: Let $0 \neq K \leq M$. Then, there exists $L \leq M$ such that $K \oplus L \leq_e M$. Hence, $\widehat{K} \oplus \widehat{L} = \widehat{M}$, but since $\widehat{M}$ is indecomposable, then $L = 0$. Thus $K \leq_e M$.

3 $\Rightarrow$ *1* : Let K and $0 \neq L$ be submodules of M such that $K_M L = 0$. Then, $K \leq Ann_M(L)$, and thus $K \cap L = 0$ by Proposition 1.22. Since M is uniform, $K = 0$. Thus, M is prime and by Theorem 2.8 M is Goldie. □

References

[1] O.D. Avraamova, "A generalized density theorem", *Abelian Group and Modules*, no. 8, Tomsk. Gos. Univ., Tomsk, 3-16 (1989).

[2] J. Beachy, "M-Injective Modules and Prime M-Ideals", *Communications in Algebra*, 30:10, 4649-4676 (2002)

[3] L. Bican, P. Jambor, T. Kepka, P. Nemec. "Prime and coprime modules", *Fundamenta matematicae*, 107:33-44 (1980).

[4] J. Castro, J. Ríos "Prime Submodules and Local Gabriel Correspondence in $\sigma[M]$ ", *Communications in Algebra*, 40:1, 213-232 (2012)

[5] J. Castro, J. Ríos, "FBN Modules", *Communications in Algebra*, 40:12, 4604-4616 (2012)

[6] J. Castro, J. Ríos, "Krull Dimension and Classical Krull Dimension of Modules", *Communications in Algebra*, 42:7, 3183-3204 (2014)

[7] Goldie, "Semiprime rings with maximum conditions", *Proc. London Math. Soc.*, **10**, 201-220 (1960)

[8] A. Haghany, M.R. Vedadi, "Study of Semi-projective Retractable Modules", *Algebra Colloquium*, **14**:3, 489-496 (2007)

[9] S. M. Khuri, "Endomorphism rings and lattice isomorphisms", *J. Algebra*, **59** (2) 401-408 (1979).

[10] T. Y. Lam, *A First Course in Noncommutative Rings*, Springer-Verlag, New York Inc. (2001)

[11] T. Y. Lam, *Lectures on Modules and Rings*, Grad. Texts in Math., vol 139, Springer, New York, (1998)

[12] S. H. Mohamed, B. J. Muller, *Continuous and Discrete Modules*, London Math. Soc. Lecture Note Series No. 147 (Cambridge University Press, 1990).

[13] A. Ozcan, A. Harmanci, P. F. Smith, "Duo Modules ", *Glasgow Math. J.*, 533-545 (2006).

[14] F. Raggi, J. Ríos, H. Rincón, R. Fernández-Alonso, C. Signoret, "Prime and Irreducible Preradicals", *J. Algebra Appl.*, Vol. 4, No. 4, 451-466. (2005)

[15] F. Raggi, J. Ríos, H. Rincón, R. Fernández-Alonso, "Basic Preradicals and Main Injective Modules ", *J. Algebra Appl.* 8(1):1-16 (2009)

[16] F. Raggi, J. Ríos, H. Rincón, R. Fernández-Alonso, "Semiprime preradicals ", *Communications in Algebra*, **37**, no. 8, 2811-2822 (2009).

[17] P.F. Smith, M.R. Vedadi, "Essentially Compressible Modules and Rings ", *J. of Algebra*, 304, 812-831 (2006).

[18] A. A. Tuganbaev, "Multiplication modules over noncommutative rings ", *Sb. Math*, 194:1837-1864 (2003).

[19] R. Wisbauer, *Foundations of Module and Ring Theory.*, Reading: Gordon and Breach (1991).

[20] R. Wisbauer, *Modules and Algebras: Bimodule Structure and Group Actions on Algebras*, England: Addison Wesley Longman Limited (1996).